

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

Applicant respectfully submits that the above noted rejection under Kaneko fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation because Kaneko fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

In addition, the above noted rejection fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because of even combining Kaneko with Miyano and/or with official notice, the structure that has been claimed is not shown or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a lens drive device that is detachably mounted to a lens device body. The detachable lens drive device includes a motor and a storage device that stores information prescribing a braking characteristic of a moving object driven by the motor. An input device receives a signal for changing the braking characteristics. A braking characteristic setting device changes the settings of the braking characteristic according to the signal received from the input device.

Independent claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, a lens drive device that is detachably mounted to various types of lens device bodies. The detachable lens drive device includes a motor portion for driving various types of moving objects and a storage portion for storing information prescribing a braking characteristic of the various types of moving objects to be driven by the motor portion. An input portion receives a signal for changing the braking characteristics. A braking characteristic setting portion changes the settings of the braking characteristic according to the signal received from the input portion. A display portion attached to the various types of lens devices bodies displays the status of the lens. A switching portion switches the display to correspond with the changing of the braking characteristics.

An aspect of the present invention is that a braking characteristic of the moving object driven by the lens drive device is changeable within the servo module itself. The lens drive device, i.e., servo module 12, is separable from the lens device 10.

In contrast to the present invention, Kaneko fails to teach or suggest the above noted aspect/feature. Specifically, Kaneko merely discloses moving a lens at a predetermined zoom rate by an operation of a quick zoom switch 32 (SW1), and automatically returning the lens at a stored zoom

position by turning off the SW1. However, Kaneko fails to teach changing a braking characteristic of the zoom, as set forth in the claimed invention.

For example, the present invention as described with relations to Figs. 5 and 12 illustrate the braking positions (brake working positions) where a brake works before a wide-angle end or a telephoto end can be changed. Thus, the braking characteristic (a characteristic curve of the braking) of a movable element, i.e., a movable lens, can be changed. Therefore, unlike Kaneko, the present invention achieves an effect whereby an optimum characteristic can be set for lenses of various types. Kaneko clearly fails to disclose the above noted feature.

Further, Miyano fails to make up for the deficiencies found in Kaneko. Like Kaneko, Miyano fails to teach or suggest changing a braking characteristic of the zoom. Thus, the combination of Kaneko with Miyano fails to make obvious the claimed invention.

In addition, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to show how it is obvious to display braking characteristics as set forth in the claimed invention. The Examiner is merely relying on official notice for such a feature. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide support, in a reference, to show such a feature as claimed, if even possible. Otherwise, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of such an official notice.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 4 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth above, over Kaneko, either alone or in combination with Miyano. As for each of the dependent claims not particularly discussed above, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above regarding their corresponding independent claims, and/or for the further features claimed therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) is respectfully solicited.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Atty. Docket No.: 0879-0275P


App. Serial No.: 09/661,292

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at (703) 205-8000 **to schedule a Personal Interview.**


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By  #40,439  
Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

  
MKM/CTB/mpe  
0879-0275P